

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, July 7, 2014 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

---

**Present:** Chair Tom Lund, Supervisor Buckley, Supervisor Erickson, Supervisor Moynihan, Supervisor Evans, Supervisor Fewell, Supervisor Vander Leest

**Also Present:** Supervisor Dantine, Supervisor Landwehr, Supervisor Van Dyck, Judy Friederichs, Marty Adams, Dale Schmit, Rob Gollman, Cora Haltaufderheid, Juliana Ruenzel, Brent Miller, Jeremy Kral, Dan Process, Chad Weininger, Sandy Juno, Maria Lasecki, Troy Streckenbach, Paul Van Noie, Brad Gajeski, other interested parties

---

---

I. **Call Meeting to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Lund at 6:00 p.m.

II. **Approve/modify agenda:**

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve. Vote taken.**  
**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. **Approve/modify Minutes of June 9, 2014.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve. Vote taken.**  
**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Comments from the Public:**

Brad Gajeski, 547 Summer Winds Drive, Green Bay, WI 54311

Gajeski wished to address the Committee regarding Item 6 on the agenda, a communication from Supervisor Dantine, regarding the problem of employee parking and its cost. Gajeski asked this Committee to approve this and put a time frame on it with a maximum of two months. He indicated parking downtown for County employees is an issue and a burden and he noted that most employees in the private sector are not required to pay for parking. He also noted that many other County departments do not have to pay for parking as they are provided on-site parking.

Gajeski asked this Committee to look into some sort of subsidized or no cost parking for employees. He reported that Dane County subsidizes parking for the vast majority of their employees, including in the area around the Capitol. He felt there should be a fair standard for all employees in Brown County and felt that the importance of the work he performs in his job downtown is equal in importance to the work done by all other County employees in all locations.

Supervisor Fewell stated that he understood Gajeski's concerns and noted that perhaps this issue should also be discussed with the Mayor of Green Bay as he was aware that deals have been made in the past with regard to parking in City ramps.

**Proclamation**

1. **Approval of Proclamation Marking August 16, 2014 as Korean War Veterans Day at Brown County Fair. Referred from Veterans' Recognition Subcommittee.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken.  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Communications**

2. **Communication from Supervisor Campbell re: Request to establish a Personnel Committee for Brown County to improve employee communications in Brown County. *Held for a month for further information.***

Supervisor Buckley indicated that he has spoken with Human Resources Director Brent Miller about this and it would be his desire to hold this matter for one month. Supervisor Evans responded that it was his understanding that the Executive Committee was also the personnel committee and he asked if the intent of this communication was to form a separate personnel committee. Buckley responded that a personnel committee could handle things such as vacant budgeted positions, parking and mileage issues and dress code issues before these issues are brought forward at the Executive Committee.

Supervisor Erickson appreciated what Buckley said but noted that most of the things that Buckley brought up have come through the Executive Committee in some shape or form. He noted that if any employee had an issue with something, they could come forward by contacting their Supervisor and the Executive Committee would attempt to handle the situation and he felt that bringing the concerns right to the Executive Committee would be the best way to handle issues.

Buckley asked if it would be Erickson's recommendation to get rid of all of the other Subcommittees and have everything done at County Board. He opined that the Executive Committee does a haphazard job of looking into employment issues and this is based on the years that he has been on the Committee.

Supervisor Fewell noted that the Administration Committee oversees HR issues such as hiring and those that are leaving employment and dealing with other HR policies. These things all come through the Administration Committee and are often referred to the Executive Committee. He felt that if the Committee structure is to be changed, it should be done at the beginning of a new term.

Supervisor Vander Leest shared that one way to deal with this may be to add a section for personnel issues on the Administration Committee agenda. He felt that the structure is already in place in the Administration Committee to deal with personnel issues. He did not think that adding a personnel committee would add value. He felt that there should be more communication and structure within the Administration Committee for personnel issues. He felt that it would be fine to continue working on the communication and come back with recommendations, but at this time he would defer to the Chair of the Administration Committee for thoughts.

Fewell responded that the Administration Committee has been addressing HR issues regularly, but he did not have a problem with this matter being held for a month.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. **Communication from Supervisor La Violette re: Hold County Board meeting at 6:30 p.m. *Held for a month.***

**Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to receive and place on file.  
Vote taken. Ayes: Fewell, Vander Leest, Erickson, Lund, Evans Nays: Buckley, Moynihan  
MOTION CARRIED 5 - 2**

4. **Communication from Supervisor Van Dyck re: To provide better continuity between programming objectives and corresponding facility requirements and to better coordinate future facility improvements to museum and library facilities under the jurisdiction of the Education and Recreation Committee. *Referred to Exec Cmte as per the County Board on 6/18/2014.***

Fewell noted that he was happy to see that Supervisor Van Dyck was present and prepared to discuss his communication. Supervisor Van Dyck provided the Committee with a handout in support of this communication, a copy of which is attached. He went over the points in the handout with the Committee.

Van Dyck stated that what he is looking for is consistency because when it comes to things with the Parks Department, those items come through Ed and Rec as did the renovations to the golf course. He felt that this would just be consistent and he did not see any reason to assume there would not be engagement with the Public Works Department whenever it would be necessary; however, he felt that initiation, coordination and efforts of property should come through the home committee.

Van Dyck continued that in the near future both the museum and the library will be facing critical decisions regarding facilities and he believes that the oversight committee is in the best position to coordinate the discussions and direct the process leading to decisions.

Vander Leest stated that he agreed with this communication and there have been discussions on this issue before. He recalled that there were major issues, including communication issues and general direction issues, on the Central Library renovations and he felt that this project should have been led by the administration as well as the Ed and Rec Committee instead of the Library Board and Facilities. Vander Leest felt that the process as outlined by Van Dyck makes more sense as the Ed and Rec Committee would have more understanding of the processes and budget goals and initiatives than another Committee who does not have the same background. He would support this communication and felt that this would probably take an ordinance change or clarification of committee structure. He continued that there are a number of things that come into play and this probably should not be done for every committee. He wants to make sure that discussions of renovations at the Central Library comes to the Ed and Rec Committee and he believes there should be a structure in place that the Library Board knows, the administration knows and the County Board knows.

Supervisor Moynihan thanked Van Dyck for being succinct in this communication and stated that he wholeheartedly agrees with his assessment of the situation.

Fewell felt that the oversight committee should always be aware of programming issues in the departments they oversee. He has no problem referring issues to the appropriate Committee but he felt strongly that programming issues really need to be run through the parent Committee. He felt that Committees should be kept abreast of all aspects of a project or issue and those issues should be worked out in the Committee and then if there a need to go further those needs could be pursued.

Erickson stated that when this is referred to staff, maybe staff should look into it a little bit as to budgeting for the items and then Facilities can do the work and be charged back.

Buckley stated that Fewell brought up a great point and noted that the Public Safety Committee has been left out of the loop regarding the building they are trying to build at the Sheriff's Department and he felt that this has caused long delays in getting the project off the ground. Buckley continued that Facilities not reporting to the Committee they are doing the work for could be costing money in potential delays.

Van Dyck agreed with Fewell and Buckley and felt that this would best be served by an additional communication and he urged someone to put forth such a communication.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to forward communication to Corporation Counsel for creation of a resolution detailing the nine bullet points contained in the handout. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

5. **Communication from Supervisor Robinson re: That the County Board handle all decisions as separate agenda items and resolutions, and not through approval of committee minutes and notes. *Referred from June County Board.***

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. **Communication from Supervisor Dantine re: To have Administration look into the problem of employee parking and its cost and report back. *Referred from June County Board.***

Supervisor Fewell thanked Supervisor Dantine for being here to address his communication. Dantine was looking for information as to how many downtown employees pay for parking and what the cost for parking is. He also noted that employees at other locations such as the Zoo, Highway Department and nursing homes do not have to pay for parking and he did not feel this was equitable. He has received calls from employees on this and he would like the administration to look into what it may cost to subsidize parking and what the options may be.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger shared information he had. He noted that there are currently 340 employees that pay to park downtown and the monthly rate ranges from \$25 - \$65. On a monthly basis, \$14,419 is paid for downtown parking and on an annual basis the amount is about \$174,500. Of the \$14,419 paid out on a monthly basis for parking, roughly \$10,000 is paid to private rentals and the rest goes to City lots. Weininger indicated that he had reached out to the City of Green Bay Mayor's office to see if County employees could receive a discount at City ramps. The Mayor advised Weininger that he would look at options in the Cherry Street ramp. Weininger will keep the Committee advised of his discussions with the Mayor. Lund indicated that we are moving into the budget season and he would like to have this done by September so that it can be added to the budget in October if necessary.

Vander Leest felt it would be important to know how other government entities handle parking; whether they pay for any or subsidize it or if it is considered as a benefit. He noted that in Madison State employees can pay upwards of \$150 - \$200 per month for parking. Vander Leest did agree that there was an issue of equity here as not all County employees have to pay for parking. He would like to see how this is handled in areas other than Brown County. He stated that Brown County has worked with the City on other issues and maybe could work together to come up with a discounted rate that could be passed along to the employees.

Erickson felt that if the City were to offer a discount to County employees parking in the ramp, there could also be an equity issue to those County employees who would not get a discount at a private

lot. Erickson would like to know how much property would be needed to make 400 parking spaces. Weininger will look into this and include it when he updates the Committee.

Fewell stated that another proposal which he thought would be fair is to look at spreading the parking costs out over the entire employee base instead of just over those employees that work downtown. If the parking costs were spread over 1,500 employees the cost to each employee would be minimal. This may be of benefit and provide leverage in negotiating parking spots if the County is collecting the money and paying out for the parking. He felt that this made some sense and then all employees would pay a small amount opposed to some paying no parking and some paying high parking rates.

Buckley asked if the private rate with higher or lower than what the City charges. Weininger responded that the rate at the Cherry Street ramp is between \$41 and \$65 per month and the private lots charge anywhere from \$22 - \$65 per month, depending on how far they are away from the County buildings. Weininger also noted that City employees are not required to pay for their own parking. Buckley suggested that Weininger look into doing some sort of master lease for parking.

Van Dyck also suggested that administration look into what the State employees who work downtown do for parking. If they are parking in the ramps, Van Dyck would like to know if they receive a discount from the City and he would also like to know how many stalls the State employees require. If the County was going to look at obtaining property for a parking lot, Van Dyck suggested that they may wish to look at a spot large enough to have extra spots that could be rented out as a revenue generator.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer to Department of Administration to report back at August meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**7. Communication from Supervisor Lund re: To discuss at Executive Committee the inclusion of full minutes in the board meeting packet. *Referred from June County Board.***

Chair Lund stated that the County Clerk was here to address this. Supervisor Moynihan indicated that there are two versions of the County Board meetings. One is an abbreviated version and one is an extended version. Moynihan felt that it would save ink and paper if the abbreviated version was included in the Board agenda packet, noting that anyone could go online to view the extended version if they wished, however, there was an uproar about this at the last Board meeting.

Fewell noted that with regard to minutes, Dane County's policy states that minutes should reflect the persons appearing, other than supervisors, the matter on which they appear and the position taken as well as positions of supervisors or members of the committee or any information furnished shall be recorded only if so requested by that member or supervisor and further that minutes shall reflect action taken but shall be kept as brief as possible. Fewell strongly felt that if someone felt they had something important to say that needs to be included in the minutes that they should tell the recording secretary that. Otherwise he felt that some of the things that are said are not included in the minutes and he noted that he wanted this point recorded in the minutes. He continued that he does not have a problem with the abbreviated minutes, however, if someone has something important to say, they should be sure the recording secretary knows it needs to be included in the minutes. For issues that are not felt to be that important, he felt that it would only be necessary to record the actions of the committee.

Vander Leest indicated that he has had to go back in the past and look for things that the County Board has voted on, particularly million dollar decisions and other large dollar decisions that can have an impact on what direction the County Board is heading. He felt a short summary of the background and the most important information adds value, otherwise there is no real record to go back. He continued that the written copy is also useful for the future and if there was not detail, there would not be any record of what happened. He felt that the basic summary is necessary in order to preserve the record. He felt that how this was handled in the past was appropriate and that there may be other ways to save costs rather than cut the minutes down. He was concerned that if the short form minutes are used there would not be a record in the future and you cannot count on supervisor recall due to turnover. He felt the historical background was very important. He noted that the State and Federal government have a summary of what happens in their minutes as well. He felt there was a fundamental need for a summary in the minutes and he would like to see that carried out. He did appreciate the County Clerk's work and felt that she has done a good job recording things and wishes that she would continue doing that.

County Clerk Sandy Juno indicated it did not make a difference to her whether the short form or long form is included in the agenda packet. She explained that the long form minutes are kept on file in the County Clerk's office and are always available online and can be accessed at any time. She continued that the short form minutes provide a synopsis that is published in the *Green Bay Press Gazette* and they went to the short form minutes to save on publication costs. The savings from publishing the short synopsis as opposed to the long form minutes is about 60%. Juno continued that County Board staff felt that including only the synopsis in the agenda would save money on printing and she noted that sometimes the long form minutes are in excess of 140 pages. Further, including only the synopsis could result in savings of \$15 - \$20.

*Supervisor Evans was excused at 6:42 pm*

Fewell felt that major decision on multi-million dollar projects and other things that are contained only in the minutes create a fundamental problem in government. He felt that all large items and multi-million dollar items or other serious issues should be in resolution form. The resolution explains exactly what is going on and there should be no question as to what the intent of the minutes are. He felt that if multi-million dollar decisions and other serious issues have to be decided on who said what at the committee meetings there is a fundamental problem. He reiterated what he said earlier that if a supervisor has a comment that they wish be contained in the minutes that they tell the recording secretary to record it. He felt that serious and large dollar items should be in resolution or ordinance form with fiscal impact and really if you want to be recorded, simply relay that to the recording secretary. Fewell questioned who makes the decision as to what one supervisor says as opposed to another supervisor says and who makes the decision as to what is recorded and what is not. Who makes the determination as to what is important and what is not? He felt that either every word should be recorded or only the motions should be recorded and those who want to be recorded when they want to be recorded, but everything should be plain and simple. He continued that they do not have these bogus things going through the State legislature; they make sure they are following legal guidelines and legal counsel so they know its legal and they can defend it and he felt that is what Brown County should do as well. He felt that recording everything is ridiculous.

Buckley asked for clarification as to the long form minutes being online or in the Clerk's office. Juno confirmed that the long form minutes are both in her office and online. Juno also noted that there are also DVD recordings of the meetings. Buckley felt that if someone had a question as to what happened at a meeting they could either stop by the Clerk's office or go online at any time to review

the long form minutes. Buckley stated that what was done for the last meeting of including only the short form minutes in the agenda packet was great.

Moynihan stated that this goes back to the last term when he offered to give the Board the opportunity to get the work done and that you could go online, click the agenda item and be taken right to that portion of the meeting and all the discussion and verbiage that ensued would be right there. He felt that all that is needed is the actual motions of the committee or County Board, just like they do in Ashwaubenon, De Pere and Green Bay. He stated that he will continue to have the short form minutes only included in the agenda packet until the Board tells him differently.

Vander Leest suggested that since there are some people that prefer the long form and others that prefer the short form, perhaps the County Board office could accommodate that by sending out the long form to those who want it and the short form to those who wish to review only the synopsis. He stated that personally he would prefer the long form as he goes through the minutes and highlights things he has questions on or wishes to work on. He felt that the Clerk's office could continue to use the short form for publication purposes. Juno also mentioned the option of supervisors printing off pertinent parts of the long form minutes from the internet at home. She stated that her staff keeps the long form minutes as full and complete as possible and they include everything in them, but this adds up in printing costs.

Fewell felt it may be cheaper to give all of the Supervisors laptops so they would have access to the minutes at any time.

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file. Vote taken. Ayes: Buckley, Moynihan, Lund, Fewell, Erickson Nay: Vander Leest. MOTION CARRIED 5 – 1.**

**Vacant Budgeted Positions (Request to Fill)**

8. **Child Support – Child Support Specialist-Enforcement - Vacated 6/3/14.**
9. **Child Support – Child Support Clerk - Vacated 6/8/14.**
10. **Child Support – Clerk/Typist I - Vacated 7/11/14.**
11. **Health – Public Health Nurse - Vacated 4/7/14.**
12. **Human Services – Clerk IV(x2) - Vacated 5/16/14, 6/20/14.**
13. **Public Works (Facilities Management) – Housekeeper .5 - Vacated 6/30/14.**
14. **Public Works (Highway) – Superintendent - Vacated 6/23/14.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to suspend the rules and take Items 8 – 14 together. Vote taken. Ayes: Moynihan, Erickson, Lund, Fewell, Vander Leest Nay: Buckley. MOTION CARRIED 5 – 1.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve Items 8 – 14. Vote taken. Ayes: Moynihan, Erickson, Lund, Fewell, Vander Leest Nay: Buckley. MOTION CARRIED 5 – 1**

**Legal Bills**

15. **Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.**

Erickson stated that he looks at the legal bills and he felt that the bills for Raven Manufacturing are included every month but the balance for attorney fees does not seem to be going down much and he felt that Met Jet seems to be headed in that direction as well. He will speak with Chuck Lamine further on this by phone at a later date.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Fewell to pay the legal bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Reports**

**16. County Executive Report.**

County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that levy targets for the budget have been delivered to the departments. As Weininger mentioned earlier they continue to find other areas and other initiatives that the County Board may want them to take on in the budget process and to find additional funding for. He stated that he is looking forward to working with the County Board to approve another budget at no levy increase.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**17. Internal Auditor Report.**

**a) Board of Supervisors Budget Status Financial Report for May, 2014.**

Internal Auditor Dan Process reported that he had sent out a communication to the supervisors asking for their feedback as to what they would like to see on a quarterly basis.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**b) Preliminary Audit Report – Purchasing Function Audit – Public Works Highway Department (Pending Final Review by Corporation Counsel).**

Process provided the Committee with a handout, a copy of which is attached, that outlines the issues, criteria, conditions, recommendations, management responses and additional comments regarding the Purchasing Function Audit.

Process outlined the major findings in the audit and thanked the Highway Department for their cooperation throughout the process and indicated that he had conversations with various individuals that were very productive. Process continued that most of the findings in areas that he felt the Department could improve on are internal controls. He noted that right now the County has a policy in place but the Highway Department and some other departments are exempt from it and Process felt that some benefit could be gained by creating a policy to help guide and provide oversight in that area. Process stated that he would recommend the policy to include things such as objectives, competitive bidding requirements, definitions, emergency purchases, alternative procedures, vendor relations and employee expectations. He felt this would help guide the department in the event of turnover and new employees who want and need some guidance. Process continued that based on the response he received, the Highway Department acknowledged that procedures could be strengthened but they do not feel that a policy change is necessary as there are state statutes that guide them; however Process still felt that a policy change would be beneficial.

Fewell stated that he understand that statutes exist, but felt that since the County funds part of the Highway Department and if the Board has policies they want them to follow, they should follow the policies. Process noted that the Highway Department is also responsible for following all other administrative polices.

Buckley felt that based on the last County Board meeting, the Highway Department should have more policies in place to handle some of these things, especially when you look at the number of purchase orders that were taken out and the number that were voided and other things shown in the audit. He felt that the Highway Department seems to do what they want to do and he did not think this is appropriate. He felt that the oversight committee really needs to work with staff on the policies and procedures as to how to run the Highway Department.

Moynihan stated that he has discussed this audit with Process and felt that maybe the oversight committee should work in concert with Corporation Counsel on this matter.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest to refer to Corporation Counsel to review and come back in 60 days. No second, no vote.**

Supervisor Landwehr asked if this could be brought back in 30 days rather than 60 days as the budget season is rapidly approaching. Lund asked Corporation Counsel Juliana Ruenzel if she could report back in 30 days and Ruenzel asked specifically what the Committee is looking for. Lund responded that they are looking for review of Process's audit and what needs to be done within the parameters of the State of Wisconsin. Ruenzel indicated that she has read the document, but she is still not exactly sure what the Committee is looking for. Lund stated that Van Noie really has dual roles and in one role he is allowed to purchase and in the other role he would have to go through the oversight committee to purchase. Ruenzel commented that purchasing is authorized by the County Board. Buckley felt that the Department of Administration and Corporation Counsel should work together on this.

Van Dyck did not feel that forwarding this back to Corporation Counsel was necessarily the answer. He understands the statutes but he felt that the question becomes not necessarily if you can do something but rather if you should. He noted that we cannot control the statutes but he felt it was ironic that certain departments have elaborate bidding processes for some things like copiers but when it comes to the Highway Department making decisions that are millions and millions of dollars they do not follow the same procedures. He felt that it might be more appropriate to refer to Committee to look over this and have a conversation to see if some of these procedures can and should be tightened up. He noted reading about executing contracts and an engineering manager managing a \$1.2 million dollar contract. He felt that when we are talking about the dollar amounts that we are talking about, that having a little bit more tightening of the rules and processes without hindering the operations does not seem too much to ask. Van Dyck continued that he felt that these issues were more procedural rather than legal and therefore he did not think that this needed to go to Corporation Counsel.

Erickson stated that they could look at this at PD & T and he felt that there were some things that he felt really should be looked at there. Process responded that one question is whether or not the state statutes allow that authorization to be designed to individuals. He does not have an issue with this if there is a benefit to it and it makes sense as long as it is documented and the statutes are followed. Moynihan indicated that that is the same reason he supports sending this to Corporation Counsel.

**Motion by substitution made by Supervisor Erickson to send to Corporation Counsel and have Corporation Counsel bring recommendations back to PD & T. No second; no vote.**

Buckley felt that the Executive or Department of Administration should probably work with Corporation Counsel on this and they should also work with the department itself to develop policies

and procedures. Moynihan stated that that would be separate; this referral deals only with the audit.

Fewell stated that some of this comes down to something you should do, or something you can do. Maybe you can do it legally, but is it something that should be done. He felt that this should be looked at as what should be done and that is what should be done. He used the example of the Medical Examiners' office who has a secretary signing death certificates. He noted that the Medical Examiner can deputize anyone he wants to do that, but that does not necessarily mean that that is what he should do. He felt that there are some things that just should not be done, even though they may be allowed by law.

Streckenbach stated that first and foremost he wants to state that internal audits are absolutely needed to keep the trust and the aspect of what the County government is doing and make sure that there is an appropriate process to review processes and move forward. That being said, he wanted to assure the Committee that the process being followed right now has not resulted in any material events that have caused harm to the taxpayers. In the discussions about improving the internal processes and looking at how we conduct business, we have a \$250 million dollar budget and there is somebody within the organization approving how those funds are expended. We have entrusted through ordinances, statutes and internal policies for those dollars to be expended in an appropriate manner that delivers the services the County Board has approved. Streckenbach indicated that Corporation Counsel has basically said that there are parameters that can be set within the ordinances or policies that we have as to how we conduct business and those recommendations are inside a document. His suggestion at this time would be to have the Department of Administration along with Public Works report back to PD & T on some things that we have internally recognized that has room for improvement. Streckenbach stated that the County has 30 departments and 1700 employees and there is a lot of different functionalities in County government and the main thing to keep in mind with regard to this audit is that there was not any material event that should cause alarm but there is room for improvements in the internal processes.

In response to a question by Moynihan, Ruenzel confirmed that she has read the audit and would be able to give her recommendations in 30 days. Moynihan responded that he wants to make sure that everyone is on the same page. Ruenzel stated that she is aware that some people in the Highway Department have signed documents and contracts that are not allowed to do so by law. By law, the Highway Commissioner has the authority to contract, but cannot delegate that authority to anyone else.

Landwehr thanked Process for the work he has done on the audit and stated that he felt he did a very thorough job and Moynihan agreed with this. He asked Process if he found anything that was very materially wrong, and if that would have been the case, would it have been included in the audit. Process indicated that that would have been the case and he also indicated that this is not considered a full department financial audit, it is strictly on the policies of the Highway Department. Landwehr continued that when the Executive spoke about how many employees and departments there are, that is true, however, 90% of all of that falls under the County's current purchasing policies and he felt that where there is a special situation like we have with the Highway Department, he felt that a lot of time and effort in cleaning it up was appropriate to get things right. It concerns him that highway management's overall responses in the second to last paragraph are that five of the seven findings were issues and the management of the Highway Department basically said that they were not willing to implement policies or the problem is with some other department or something like that. However, at the conclusion of the audit the Highway Department stated that at the end of the day, there were no substantive findings and it is good to

know that staff and procedures are adequate, although they could be strengthened. He felt that the Department does not wish to acknowledge any of these things. He agreed with the motion that we need Administration to be the one responsible for getting this straightened out.

Fewell stated that the Auditor is there to help us avoid big problems in proactive ways. The Auditor is looking at internal controls and looking for possible holes in the system and the Highway Department is saying that there are holes and the Committee is seeing that these holes need to be fixed. Process agreed and stated that he tried to incorporate the controls that are already in place and indicate where the strengths are. Process said it is his responsibility to record his recommendations that should be implemented and then it is up management to determine what to do with the recommendations.

Van Dyck was concerned about the information in the audit that stated in the summary that the department had spent an estimated 150 – 200 hours of staff time which cost an estimated \$8,000 - \$10,000 in meeting with the auditor, and providing and preparing documents. He had an issue with this and was looking for an explanation.

Van Noie responded to Van Dyck's concerns by saying that there were approximately four or five visits by the Auditor to the Highway Department and questions that were asked on the first visit were asked again and again on subsequent visits. Van Noie felt that the audit could have been completed based on the answers to the questions given on the first visit. Fewell noted that the same questions were probably asked a number of times because answers were not provided to Process. Van Noie disagreed with this and stated that Process did get the answers. Van Noie stated that they spent a great amount of time and resources on this audit.

Process disagreed with this and stated that a number of the answers to questions required further clarification. Process shared the time line of this audit with the Committee members. He stated that the engagement letter went out on January 29 and he first met with Van Noie on February 17 and he did not meet with staff until March. Process recalled three on site visits and then he compiled his findings and forwarded them on to Van Noie asking for response and it took almost a month to get the responses back. Process stated that he was informed that the Highway Department was busy with snow plowing in the winter and was then busy getting ready for spring and summer projects that were beginning and he allowed for some leeway on this. He noted, however, that the entire audit was spread over several months and he did agree with Van Dyck that it did take a great amount of time. He also noted that recommendations were mailed out on May 28 and he did not get any response to the report until June 30. Further, Process felt that many of the responses were more in defense of the actions of the Highway Department versus embracing the recommendations. He noted that similar recommendations were made to Purchasing and he felt that Purchasing provided more cooperation and understanding on their part. Process reiterated that he felt the controls were there but needed to be strengthened and he also commented that the people he spoke to at the Highway Department seem to be trying to do what is best for the County and it is just a matter of mitigating risks and making sure the statutes are being followed.

Fewell stated that he is in full support of Process's audit and thinks he did a very good job and we have to work together to be sure we are doing the best for the taxpayers.

**Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to refer to Corporation Counsel and the Department of Administration and come back in 60 days. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

c) **Quarterly Status Update (April 1 – June 30, 2014).**

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

18. **Human Resources Report.**

a) **Discussion re: Mileage reimbursement rate for sanitarians. *Motion at June Human Services: Refer to Admin and Exec Cmte; Motion at June Admin: Refer to Exec Cmte with appropriate fiscal impact numbers.***

Miller and Weininger addressed this with the Committee. Weininger provided a brief history that in August, 2011 the County Board approved an ordinance to pay 80% of the IRS rate as mileage reimbursement for employees not under contract who use their personal vehicles for in County business. In January, 2014 this issue was brought up by the sanitarians and they are seeking to be reimbursed for mileage at 100% of the IRS rate. This matter has been addressed at the Human Services Committee as well as the Administration Committee. The Human Services Committee indicated that they would like to know what the total cost would be for the County if mileage reimbursement was paid at 100% of the IRS rate. This information has been compiled and a calculation was provided to the Committee, a copy of which is attached. As shown on the handout, the cost to go from 80% of the IRS rate to 100% of the IRS rate would be \$44,887.58 based on 2013 numbers.

Miller stated that the Sheriff's Department already receives 100% of the IRS rate and therefore would not have any change. Miller also stated that Syble Hopp has two entries on the handout because one is the portion for administration that comes under the County and the other portion is for the part that comes under the school board.

Vander Leest asked what the rationale was for the County Board to reduce the mileage reimbursement from 100% of the IRS rate to 80% as he does not recall this. Moynihan stated that the reduction must have been done for budgetary reasons. Vander Leest asked what Miller and Weininger's recommendation would be and Weininger stated that they are simply fulfilling the request to provide information. Fewell asked if a change would require an ordinance change and it was indicated that it would. Vander Leest stated that he would like to have an understanding as to how this change came about and Weininger indicated that if the Committee desired to send this back, he would be able to do some more research on this matter but it could take some time. Vander Leest stated that it was always good to know the history and background of an issue before any decisions are made.

Erickson noted that the IRS rate fluctuates and is basically designed for tax purposes. He stated that he was on the road for 25 years and never ran into a company that paid 100% of the IRS rate. He has found that typically a company will reimburse at about 80% of the IRS rate and sometimes even less. The situation is when you file taxes, if you get reimbursed at 80%, you take the other 20% as a deduction on your income taxes. He did not feel this was complicated and felt that the way it is working now is fair as everyone across the board receives 80% reimbursement. He noted that only the Health Department has brought this issue up and he felt that if there were a number of employees that were concerned about this, the meeting room would be filled with employees who wished to address it. Since this is not the case Erickson does not see this as a big deal and is comfortable with the 80%.

Buckley asked what the mileage charges were for some of the departments listed on the handout. Miller responded that the charges are incurred when employees travel to conferences and things of

that nature. He noted that he could drive his large truck to Madison for a conference and pay \$80 in mileage which is still less than 80% of the IRS rate. Buckley felt that for some departments that submit charges one or two times per year, the rate should remain at 80%. Moynihan stated that if the rate is changed, it would be changed across the board for all departments.

Fewell stated that in all fairness, even though he has his own feelings, it would be a lot more expensive for the County to provide vehicles and have to pay for the gas and upkeep. One of the things that Fewell discussed with Weininger is that his company uses software that keeps track of and figures out the mileage by GPS. It is accurate and he felt could reduce the costs by 30%. He felt that using a GPS to keep track of mileage and where employees are would add transparency and accountability. He would not have a problem increasing the mileage reimbursement to 100% of the IRS rate provided some technology is used to keep track of an employee's whereabouts and actual mileage. He felt that adding GPS technology would actually reduce the amount of mileage reimbursement by a significant amount.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Dale Schmit, Brown County Health Department, addressed the Committee. He indicated that some of the points brought up by the Committee have been brought up before and are being misunderstood. For example, with regard to deducting the difference between the reimbursed rate and the full IRS rate on individual taxes, this can only be done if total mileage is over 2% of your gross income. He also stated that under Chapter 3 of the Code, travel outside of the County is to be done in a County vehicle, but if you use your personal vehicle you get reimbursed at 80% and he noted that the sanitarians only travel in the County to go their licensed facilities and the travel rate is incorporated in their license fees. With regard to Fewell's suggestion of using a GPS, Schmit noted that their time at a facility is documented under their inspection software. This software documents when they arrive and when they leave. Further, in terms of comparables, he is aware that all of the surrounding health departments pay their sanitarians the IRS rate and this has been the same for represented groups as well as unrepresented groups. Finally, he wished to mention that Chapter 3 talks about the optimal amount, but he felt that that was a typographical error and should read optional and if you choose not to use the IRS rate than you can use the formula to determine mileage.

Marty Adams, 1848 Mill Road, Greenleaf, Wisconsin. Adams stated that he brought this issue forward in January. He stated that he has been a sanitarian with the County for 20 years and for all of those years until 2011 they were reimbursed for mileage at the full IRS rate. He continued that 85% of what he does is visit business. He stated that he travels in the County all day and does not travel out of the County. He stated that policy that is on the record is for out of county travel. He travels all day, every day, with his own personal vehicle. Today he left the office and went to businesses whose fees were set four years ago by the Board for the businesses and those fees have not been cut by one penny.

Adams continued that there are 1700 employees in the County and they all have the same cost as the four sanitarians had last year. He stated that the County would be looking at an additional cost of \$725,000 if the IRS rate were paid, but as shown on the handout, the amount is \$44,000. The sanitarians have been paying a lot, lot more than everyone else and drive their vehicles a lot more than everyone else. He stated that he is losing \$400 - \$500 per year by only being paid 80% of the IRS rate. He finds it despicable that Brown County has a County Board that will pay some employees a higher amount than other employees. When you talk about equity, he finds this inequitable. He stated that this is all coming out of tax dollars and 85% of it is coming from the licenses facilities that

they oversee. He invited anyone to come along with him to see that his mileage is accurate and correct.

Every day he writes where he leaves from, where he goes to, what the address is and what he goes there from. He noted that mileage fluctuates when he leaves home to go directly to a site or when there may be detours. Buckley asked if Adams received mileage from his home to work and Adams responded that he does not. He only is paid mileage when he leaves his home to go directly to a call. When he leaves home to come into the office, those miles are his own responsibility. He did understand that the Sheriff's Department's mileage is negotiated, but he felt that it should be equal and fair. With regard to claiming the unreimbursed portion on your personal taxes, Adams stated that this is totally false. He felt that 100% of the IRS rate is budgeted for and included in the license fees and should therefore be paid to the employees.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

With regard to the Sheriff's Department, Erickson asked how many miles were involved. Miller responded that the amount budgeted for Sheriff's Department mileage is \$4,000 - \$5,000. Erickson also stated that all employees drive to work and some drive from other counties and do not get paid mileage.

Landwehr agreed with Erickson's earlier comments and stated that he also drives for a living and has never been paid the full IRS rate. He also noted that some companies require employees to have cars that are not more than three or four years old to keep things as efficient as possible and he noted that there are additional costs associated with driving an older vehicles.

Fewell stated that the County is paying out \$179,000 to employees for mileage. You have to look at this as the glass being 80% full. He noted that he also drives for a living and does not get the full IRS rate either and he felt it would be rare for anyone to be paid the IRS rate. He felt that for employees to say that they were having money taken out of the pockets is not true, the County is actually putting money into the employees' pocket.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer to staff and come back in 30 days. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Resolutions, Ordinances**

19. **An Ordinance Amending Section 2.13 of Chapter 2 of the Brown County Code Entitled "Meetings, Agendas".**

Moynihan stated that he brought this up after speaking with Supervisor Sieber following the last County Board meeting. Sieber felt the ordinance was a little vague and felt that some language could be added to tighten it up a little bit. The changes are noted in the underlined portion of the proposed ordinance contained in the agenda packet.

**Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Other**

20. **Such other matters as authorized by law.**

Chair Lund indicated that next month's meeting will be held at the regular time of 5:30 p.m.

21. **Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to adjourn at 7:56 p.m.  
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Recording Secretary

Executive Committee Meeting  
July 7, 2014

Communication from Supervisor Van Dyck

To provide better continuity between programming objectives and corresponding facility requirements and to better coordinate future facility improvements the museum and library facilities should be under the jurisdiction of the Education and Recreation Committee.

- This request is specific to the museum and libraries and is not intended to apply to any other departments and/or facilities which was a concern expressed by several supervisors at the Board meeting.
- While there was some conversation at the Board meeting about having all facility needs initiated from the oversight committee that is not the intent of this communication.
- The museum and library facilities are stand alone and unique to their functions.
- The library encompasses eight different branches and likely serves the largest number of Brown County residents.
- The library has its own maintenance staff and regularly engages in building projects outside the oversight of the Public Works Department.
- The Public Works Department gave regular updates at the Ed & Rec meetings during the Downtown Library renovations.
- Both the Museum (Foundation and Board) and the Library (Board) have multiple levels of oversight that need to be engaged in any major decisions regarding facilities. The Ed & Rec Committee will be engaged in coordinating the multiple stake holders. Adding another layer to the process is unnecessary and cumbersome.
- The museum and library are unique in their ability to draw private funding for renovation and/or new construction.
- The Ed & Rec committee already manages facility requests at the NEW Zoo, golf course and all parks. In addition, Ed & Rec oversees current decisions made by the Library Board regarding facilities, such as leasing the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the downtown branch or lease space for the East Side branch, etc.

In the near future, both the museum and library will be facing critical decisions regarding facilities. I believe the oversight committee, Education & Recreation, is in the best position to coordinate the discussions and direct the process leading to decisions.

**Brown County Board of Supervisors  
Internal Audit  
Findings & Recommendations (Explanations)**

**Issue**

Issue or internal control weakness identified.

**Criteria**

Standard(s) used to test the control (e.g., regulations, policies and procedures, best practices, etc.)

**Condition**

Observation(s) made during testing. Test results are included to help support the issue/internal control weakness identified.

**Recommendation**

Recommended actions management should take in order to address the issue or internal control weakness identified.

**Management Response**

Management's response to the issue or internal control weakness identified and the recommendation made.

**Additional Internal Audit Comment (If Required)**

Internal Audit's reply to management's response.

**Mileage Pivot Table -2013**

<u>Row Labels</u>	<u>80%</u> <u>Sum of \$</u>	<u>100% Difference</u>	
Sanitarians	7,567.84	9,459.80	1,891.96
Reg in Probate	39.76	49.70	9.94
Admin	120.23	150.29	30.06
Child Support	421.18	526.48	105.30
Circuit Courts	254.43	318.04	63.61
Clerk of Courts	130.18	162.73	32.55
Corp Council	1,769.14	2,211.43	442.29
Correctionals	20.96	26.20	5.24
County Board	1,730.38	2,162.98	432.60
County Clerk	1,264.20	1,580.25	316.05
County Exec	375.55	469.44	93.89
Court Commision	588.24	735.30	147.06
CTC	506.68	633.35	126.67
DA	92.21	115.26	23.05
HR	186.37	232.96	46.59
Human Services	148,728.04	185,910.05	37,182.01
ME's	350.22	437.78	87.56
Parks	396.82	496.03	99.21
Planning	296.06	370.08	74.02
Port & Recovery	2,628.84	3,286.05	657.21
Public Safety	2,126.39	2,657.99	531.60
Public Works	197.09	246.36	49.27
Purchasing	99.44	124.30	24.86
Reg in Probate	540.04	675.05	135.01
Reg of Deeds	553.24	691.55	138.31
Sheriff		0.00	0.00
Syble Hopp-	726.92	908.65	181.73
Syble Hopp *	4,583.85	5,729.81	1,145.96
Treasurer	741.28	926.60	185.32
TS	911.23	1,139.04	227.81
UWExt	1,553.64	1,942.05	388.41
<u>Zoo</u>	<u>49.72</u>	<u>62.15</u>	<u>12.43</u>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>179,550.97</b>	<b>224,438.75</b>	<b>44,887.58</b>